

Internationalized Registration Data Working Group

Summary of Discussion

15 March 2010

Attendees: Jeremy Hitchcock, Co-Chair, James Galvin, Ram Mohan, Steve Metalitz, Jiankang Yao, Avri Dora; from staff: Dave Piscitello, Glen de Saint Gery, Francisco Aries, Steve Sheng.

Actions Items:

ICANN staff will develop a matrix that identifies different models for registration data and the impact of each model on potential stakeholders.

Discussion Summary:

The staff first summarized the working group progress up to date. (See last meeting notes.) The staff also briefed the WG members on the relevant Universal Postal Union (UPU) standards (See the UPU standard email in the archives at: <http://forum.icann.org/lists/ssac-gnso-irdwg/msg00081.html>). The staff pointed out that the UPU standards were presented as a principle or analogy since there is no direct comparison for postal addressing to Whois.

The Chair then asked the WG members to consider whether or not to use the UPU standard as a principle model for internationalized registration data (that requiring a “must be present” script, with the addition to other scripts). Members of the WG have expressed different opinions.

The staff pointed out that the original intent of looking at the UPU standard was to try to understand how the postal system dealt with local languages. The staff did not intend to suggest that the UPU standard was the only option that the WG members should consider.

Some WG members felt that the base requirement of having something that anyone in the world can understand is valid. In addition, they agreed it also would be useful to have a standard that was accessible to local users.

However, other WG members felt that UPU standard applies more in a peer-to-peer relationship, but the WHOIS model is a one-to-many relationship. Furthermore, if a letter is mailed within a country, then it is only necessary to provide the address in the local script. Similarly, today’s Whois frequently is used locally, in which case it would not be necessary to provide the information in anything other than the local script.

To assist in the IRD-WG’s deliberations on this issue, some WG members suggested that it might be useful for staff to develop a matrix that identified different models and their impact on potential stakeholders. The matrix could systematically explore different models proposed, their impacts on the registrars (both traditional and IDN), registries, registrant, and users of Whois (both human user and also legitimate automated clients).

The WG members participating in the call agreed that this was a good idea and asked the staff to move forward. The staff pointed out that this would be a qualitative exercise to

examine the potential impacts and help to clarify alternative proposals. The WG members also asked the staff to consider both the primary effect and secondary effect to each of the stakeholders.

	Impact to registrars (existing and new IDN based)	Impact to registries (gTLD and ccTLD)	Impact to registrant	Impact to users of Whois
Model 1:				
...				

Several models will be considered initially:

Model 1: Requiring registrants to provide a “must be present” language to Whois, and in addition give the option to provide data in local languages as well.

Model 2: Registrants provide their registration data in a script that can be accepted by the registrar, and registrar to provide a point of contact for translation and abuse issues based on request.

Model 3: Registrants provide their registration data in a script that can be accepted by the registrar, and registrar provide translation service and publish it in a “must be present” language in Whois.